

REMARKS

The Examiner noted that a certified copy of the German priority application had not been filed. However, such certified copy was previously filed with the international application. Thus, it is believed to be unnecessary to file a certified copy of the German priority application in connection with this U.S. application in order to perfect the claim for priority herein.

The Examiner objected to the drawings because reference number 249 was used in the specification to refer to two different structures. The specification has been amended to obviate this drawing objection.

The Examiner also objected to Fig. 5 of the drawings because the features appearing between the screws 220 and 230 were not identified by reference numbers. Attached hereto is a photocopy of Fig. 5 with such reference numbers added. Upon approval by the Examiner, formal drawings will be submitted including such revisions.

The Examiner further objected to the drawings because they did not show the limitations of Claim 2. However, the attachment screws illustrated in the drawings are expansion screws, as recited in Claim 2.

The Examiner objected to the specification because the status of the international application was not specified. The specification has been amended to set forth such status.

The Examiner indicated that the two foreign prior art references identified in the specification had not been considered. The applicant appreciates the Examiner's observation in this regard and notes that the U.S. equivalents for such foreign prior art references were listed on the PTO-1449 form filed with the application and, therefore, have been considered by the Examiner.

The specification has also been amended to address the Examiner's concerns regarding the incorrect reference number.

The Examiner also objected to the specification and claims as not providing a proper antecedent basis for the limitations of several claims. The specification and claims have been amended to address each of these concerns.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to including the salient limitations of dependent Claim 3, which was indicated by the Examiner to be allowable if re-written in independent form. Thus, it is believed that independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2, 4, 7-9, 13-16, and 18-23 are in condition for allowance.

New Independent Claim 24 includes the salient limitations of independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 7 and 8, which were indicated by the Examiner to be allowable if re-written in independent form. Thus, it is believed that independent Claim 24 and dependent Claims 25-38 are also in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard S. MacMillan
Reg. No. 30,085

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 255-5900